REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-15 are pending. Claims 1, 5 and 15 have been amended, claim 16 is new. The specification has been amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In this office action, Examiner:

(i) objected to the drawings as not comporting with 37 CFR 1.84(p);

(ii) objected to an IDS filed with the application as not comporting with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3); and

(iii) rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (a).

The rejections are dealt with in turn below.

1. Objection to the Drawings

Examiner objected to the Drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) because they include the reference to Figure 7, element 51 that is not mentioned in the description. The above referenced amendment to the specification should correct this deficiency. Element 51 in Figure 7 is now properly referenced as the 1D footprint of the stretched texel.

In light of this amendment, Applicants respectfully request the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

2. Objection to IDS under 37 C.F.R. 1.98(a)(3)

Examiner objected to the IDS filed 19 July, 2011 for failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.98(a)(3) because it did not include a concise explanation of the references. But because the English translation of the Abstract is now disclosed and only non-English reference is so closely related to another, English reference, the same explanation of the relevance of the two references are the same. Therefore, no further explanation should be necessary for the non-English reference.

37 C.F.R. 1.98(a)(3)(i) states that a concise explanation is only needed for non-English references. In our case, the only reference not printed in English is reference CN 1212412A. But

this reference is related to reference US 6,111,585 to Choi, printed in English. In fact, CN 1212412A claims priority from the same Korean application (KR 47711/97) that the English reference, US 6,111,585 to Choi claims. Also, an English Abstract for CN 1212412A is available on the PRC Patent and Trademark office website.

To aid the Examiner, the Applicants have attached to this office action response information relating to CN 1212412: in Tab 1, an Espacenet screenshot showing the patent family, relating CN 1212412 and US 6,111,585; in Tab 2, an Espacenet screenshot showing the English abstract; and in Tab 3, a screenshot from the Chinese Patent Office for CN 1212412 showing the abstract in English. Also in Tab 4, Applicants have attached a modified IDS showing the change to the Foreign Reference, and including an English abstract and relation to the US patent.

Therefore, the English translation of the abstract should explain the relevance of the reference. Also, because the only non-English reference has an English equivalent reference already cited, (namely, US 6,111,585 to Choi), the same explanation of relevance should also apply to it. Based on these explanations, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the IDS under 37 C.F.R. 1.98(a)(3) be withdrawn.

3. Rejection of Claims 1-15 Under §102(a)

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by Loenen et. al, Edge Anti-aliased Two Pass Forward Texture Mapping, pages 1-51, 8-22-2000, ("Loenen"). It is respectfully submitted that Loenen fails to disclose all the elements of independent claims 1 and 8, and as such, cannot stand as anticipatory rejections under 102(a). And as claims 2-7 depend on claim 1, and claims 9-15 depend on claim 8, it is respectfully submitted that they are also not anticipated by Loenen.

Claim 1 recites a graphics processor that includes:

a texture space rasterizer for rasterizing a primitive in texture space,

a color generating unit for determining the color of the output of the texture space rasterizer and for forwarding a color sample along with coordinates,

a 2-pass screen space resampler for resampling the color sample determined by the color generating unit, and

at least one one-dimensional blur filter unit associated to at least one pass of said 2-pass screen space resampler for performing a one-dimensional blur filtering before performing said at least one pass.

Loenen discloses a " an extension to the initial two pass forward texture mapping implementation by K. Meinds which is capable of generating high quality edge anti-aliased images of texture mapped polygons." (Loenen page 3.) But Loenen does not disclose "a texture spaced rasterizer" as claimed in claim 1.

Nor does Loenen disclose a "a color generating unit for determining the color of the output of the texture space rasterizer and for forwarding a color sample along with coordinates," as claimed in claim 1. Claim 8 similarly discloses "determining the color of the output of the rasterizing step and forwarding a color sample along with coordinates." But the word "color" does not even appear in Loenen. Therefore, Loenen can not anticipate claims 1 or 8 as it is missing an element, dealing with color. Base on this, Loenen also fails to anticipate "a 2-pass screen space resampler for resampling the color sample determined by the color generating unit," as claimed in claim 1.

Further, Loenen does not disclose a "blur filter" as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Loenen cannot anticipate a "at least one one-dimensional blur filter unit associated to at least one pass of said 2-pass screen space resampler for performing a one-dimensional blur filtering before performing said at least one pass," as claimed in claim 1. Claim 8 similarly discloses "performing at least one one-dimensional blur filtering before performing at least one pass resampling." Because Loenen does not disclose a blur filter, an element in the independent claims 1 and 8, it cannot anticipate claims 1 and 8. Therefore, it cannot be used as a 102(a) rejection of claims 1 and 8 and also the claims depending on 1 and 8, claims 2-7 and 9-15.

In light of the above details, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw rejections to claims 1 -15 in light of Loenen.

<div align="center">CONCLUSION</div>

For all of these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated by Loenen, and that this rejection should be withdrawn. Claim 8 similarly recites the method of claim 1, and claim 15 recites a computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program for performing a method according to claim 8, and thus claims 8 and 15 are considered allowable for the reasons set forth above. Claim 2-7 an 9-14 depend upon claim 1 or claim 8, and are also considered allowable for the reasons set forth above. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 1-15 are not anticipated by Loenen, and that this rejections should be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in an allowable form, and action to that end is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to grant any extensions of time, as well as charge any fees which may be required, or credit in the overpayment, to Deposit Account No. **07-1896** referencing Docket No. **348162-982860**.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA PIPER LLP, US

Dated: March 13, 2012   By: /Blake W. Jackson/
                                          Blake W. Jackson
                                          Reg. No. 66,272
                                          Attorney for Applicant(s)
Blake W. Jackson
DLA Piper LLP (US)
2000 University Avenue
East Palo Alto, CA 94303-2248

650-833-2248 (Direct)
650-833-2000 (Main)
650-687-1182 (Facsimile)
blake.jackson@dlapiper.com

Attachments:
Tab 1 - Screenshot of patent family information
Tab 2 – Screenshot of English Abstract from Espacenet
Tab 3 – Screenshot of English Abstract from Chinese Patent Office
Tab 4 – Copy of IDS with proper Foreign Reference explanation